UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,944	03/30/2004	Jonathan J. Hull	20412-08454	8290

76137 7590 09/29/2009

RICOH/FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
TRAN, MYLINH T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/29/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOC@FENWICK.COM
gsueoka@fenwick.com
nmorad@fenwick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/814,944	HULL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MYLINH TRAN	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 June 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-12,14-17,19-27,29-31,33-38 and 40-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-12,14-17,19-27,29-31,33-38 and 40-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration has been entered and been carefully considered. The arguments regarding 35 U.S.C 102 and 103 rejections were persuasive. However, the claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 29-31, 33-38 and 40-51 have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record and newly discovered prior art. Therefore, these claims are rejected under the new ground of rejection as set forth below.

IDS

The IDS filed 08/20/2009 has been considered. The NPL has been crossed out because it will not be printed on the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the

applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 36-38, 40-48 and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowitz et al. [US. 5,485,554] in view of French et al. [US. 6,396,594].

As to claims 1 and 27, Lowitz et al. teaches displaying a print dialog driver box to a user (column 12, lines 20-50);

a user interface for receiving instruction from a user for controlling segmentation of media content (column 5, lines 8-25) for printing based on one or more features within the media content (column 4, lines 8-25) and for generation of a printable representation of the media content (column 4, lines 8-25), and the instructions from the user comprising selection of a segment of the representation of the media content (column 5, lines 17-50);

and a media analysis module communicatively coupled to the user interface, the media analysis module analyzing features of the media content to extract the segment of the media content selected from the representation based at least in part on the instructions received from the user in the user interface (column 11, lines 3-30),

a media representation generation module for generating a printable representation of the media content based at least in part on the extracted segment of the media content (column 12, lines 20-50); and an output device

for printing the printable representation of the media content to a tangible medium (column 13, lines 12-50).

Lowitz et al. fail to clearly teach the step of displaying a graphical representation of the media content. However, French et al. teach the graphical representation of the media content at column 6, lines 28-60, cited “a pictorial representation of an administrator user interface for a print queue including a queue watermark property in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention is illustrated. User interface 402 in the example depicted employs the card file metaphor common to system controls for operating systems utilizing a graphical user interface (GUI). A "card" or page 404 for selecting queue options includes a section 406 for defining the queue watermark. The queue watermark may be selected from predefined watermarks 408 or customized utilizing custom controls 410. Custom controls 410 preferably permit selection of a graphic image for the watermark, specification of watermark text, including font type and size, and specification of the watermark location on the page. An image window 412 may also be included for displaying a "thumbnail" image of the selected watermark.” It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine graphical representation of the media content of French et al. with the teachings of Lowitz. Motivation of the combination would have been to promote user’s interactions.

As to claim 2, Lowitz also teaches the media analysis module further comprising content recognition software for recognizing the analyzed features in the media content (column 10, lines 5-50).

As to claim 3, Lowitz fails teaches processing logic for controlling display of the user interface. However, French et al. teach “User interface 402 in the example depicted employs the card file metaphor common to system controls for operating systems utilizing a graphical user interface (GUI). A "card" or page 404 for selecting queue options includes a section 406 for defining the queue watermark. The queue watermark may be selected from predefined watermarks 408 or customized utilizing custom controls 410. Custom controls 410 preferably permit selection of a graphic image for the watermark, specification of watermark text, including font type and size, and specification of the watermark location on the page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine graphical representation of the media content of French et al. with the teachings of Lowitz. Motivation of the combination would have been to promote user’s interactions.

As to claim 5, Lowitz also teaches hardware for writing a digital media representation of the media content in digital format (column 4, lines 8-25).

As to claim 6, Lowitz teaches a storage medium for storing the digital representation of the media content written in digital format (column 6, lines 1-36).

As to claims 7 and 48, Lowitz teaches the output device being configured to print to a paper format (column 2, lines 5-35).

As to claim 8, Lowitz fails to clearly teach the output device being configured to print at least one user-selectable identifier associated with the media content. However, French et al. teach “User interface 402 in the example depicted employs the card file metaphor common to system controls for operating systems utilizing a graphical user interface (GUI). A "card" or page 404 for selecting queue options includes a section 406 for defining the queue watermark. The queue watermark may be selected from predefined watermarks 408 or customized utilizing custom controls 410. Custom controls 410 preferably permit selection of a graphic image for the watermark, specification of watermark text, including font type and size, and specification of the watermark location on the page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine graphical representation of the media content of French et al. with the teachings of Lowitz. Motivation of the combination would have been to promote user’s interactions.

As to claim 9, Lowitz teaches at least one barcode identifying the media content in the printable representation (column 11, lines 10-30).

As to claims 10 and 44, Lowitz teaches at least one play identifier that can be selected to play an associated media content (column 11, lines 3-30).

As to claims 11 and 45, Lowitz teaches a data structure for representing transformation of media content (column 4, lines 8-25).

As to claim 12, Lowitz teaches a communication monitoring module for monitoring communication between the components of the system, wherein the communication monitoring module forwards requests for information and replies to requests among system components (column 2, lines 15-34).

As to claims 14 and 40, Lowitz teaches a field for setting a threshold on confidence values associated with results of analyzing the features of the media content (column 10, lines 23-50).

As to claims 15 and 42, Lowitz teaches at least one field for managing and modifying display of media information in the printable representation of the media representation (column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 8).

As to claims 16 and 41, Lowitz teaches a preview field for previewing active media frames within selected media content (column 9, lines 1-20).

As to claim 17, Lowitz teaches a preview field for previewing the printable representation generated by the media representation generation module (column 9, lines 1-20).

As to claims 19 and 43, Lowitz teach a selector that a user can slide along the content selection field in order to select the segment (column 9, lines 50-65).

As to claim 20, Lowitz fails to clearly teach graphical representation of the media content enables a user to view the media content and select segments of the media content (figure 4). However, French et al. teach “User interface 402

in the example depicted employs the card file metaphor common to system controls for operating systems utilizing a graphical user interface (GUI). A "card" or page 404 for selecting queue options includes a section 406 for defining the queue watermark. The queue watermark may be selected from predefined watermarks 408 or customized utilizing custom controls 410. Custom controls 410 preferably permit selection of a graphic image for the watermark, specification of watermark text, including font type and size, and specification of the watermark location on the page.. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine graphical representation of the media content of French et al. with the teachings of Lowitz. Motivation of the combination would have been to promote user's interactions.

As to claim 21, Lowitz teaches an audio waveform timeline displaying audio content (column 10, lines 24-50).

As to claim 22, Lowitz teaches a video timeline displaying video frames extracted from video content (column 10, line 50 through column 11, line 10).

As to claim 23, Lowitz also teaches a video timeline displaying text extracted from video content (column 4, lines 8-25).

As to claim 24, Lowitz teaches a field for displaying the results of analyzing the media content, the results of being displayed as defined segments along a timeline (column 10, lines 23-56).

As to claim 25, Lowitz fails to clearly teach an output device driver module for

driving the media content analysis and the media representation generation, the output device driver module being communicatively coupled to the user interface to receive user instructions. However, French et al. teach User interface 402 in the example depicted employs the card file metaphor common to system controls for operating systems utilizing a graphical user interface (GUI). A "card" or page 404 for selecting queue options includes a section 406 for defining the queue watermark. The queue watermark may be selected from predefined watermarks 408 or customized utilizing custom controls 410. Custom controls 410 preferably permit selection of a graphic image for the watermark, specification of watermark text, including font type and size, and specification of the watermark location on the page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine graphical representation of the media content of French et al. with the teachings of Lowitz. Motivation of the combination would have been to promote user's interactions.

As to claim 26, Lowitz also teaches an augmented output device for generating a media representation, the augmented output device being communicatively coupled to the media analysis software module to receive transformed media data, the augmented output device being communicatively coupled to the output device driver module to receive instructions for media representation generation (column 10, lines 5-50).

As to claims 36 and 46-47, Lowitz teaches adding a print function to a media rendering application for printing a media representation (column 5, lines 1-25).

As to claim 37, Lowitz teaches storing media content on a storage medium that is accessible to augmented output device (column 11, lines 30-67).

As to claim 38, Lowitz teaches the print dialog box further displaying media content formatting options to a user (column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 8).

As to claims 49-50, Lowitz fails to clearly teach one or more timelines and an option to specify a number of timelines displayed per page. However, French et al. teach “User interface 402 in the example depicted employs the card file metaphor common to system controls for operating systems utilizing a graphical user interface (GUI). A "card" or page 404 for selecting queue options includes a section 406 for defining the queue watermark. The queue watermark may be selected from predefined watermarks 408 or customized utilizing custom controls 410. Custom controls 410 preferably permit selection of a graphic image for the watermark, specification of watermark text, including font type and size, and specification of the watermark location on the page.” It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine graphical representation of the media content of French et al. with the teachings of Lowitz. Motivation of the combination would have been to promote user’s interactions.

As to claim 51, Lowitz fails to clearly teach an edit segment option to edit a length of the defined segment. However, French et al. teach "User interface 402 in the example depicted employs the card file metaphor common to system controls for operating systems utilizing a graphical user interface (GUI). A "card" or page 404 for selecting queue options includes a section 406 for defining the queue watermark. The queue watermark may be selected from predefined watermarks 408 or customized utilizing custom controls 410. Custom controls 410 preferably permit selection of a graphic image for the watermark, specification of watermark text, including font type and size, and specification of the watermark location on the page." It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine graphical representation of the media content of French et al. with the teachings of Lowitz. Motivation of the combination would have been to promote user's interactions.

Claims 29-31 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowitz et al. [US. 5,485,554] in view of French et al. [US. 6,396,594] and further in view of Freedman [US. 2004/0249650].

As to claim 29, Lowitz in view of French et al. fail to clearly teach performing speech recognition on the media data. However, Freedman teaches the feature

at page 8, 0045. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Freedman with the Lowitz's teaching. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claim 30, Lowitz in view of French et al. fail to clearly teach the optical character recognition on the media data. However, Freedman teaches the features at page 15, 0064. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Freedman with the Lowitz's teaching. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claims 31 and 34, Lowitz in view of French et al. fail to clearly teach analyzing features of media data further comprises performing face recognition on the media data. However, Freedman teaches the features at page 15, 0064. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Freedman with the Lowitz's teaching. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claim 33, Lowitz in view of French et al. fail to clearly teach performing speaker detection on the media data. However, Freedman teaches the features at page 9, 0048. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at

the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Freedman with the Lowitz's teaching. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claim 35, Lowitz in view of French et al. fail to clearly teach performing event detection on the media data. However, Freedman teaches the features at page 6, 0040. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Freedman with the Lowitz's teaching. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 29-31, 33-38 and 40-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179